

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Litan (*Brookings-Wharton Papers on Financial Services*) in view of eSpeed (*eSpeed Signs Deal with 7 Online Brokers to Give Consumers the Ability to Trade Bonds the Same Way They Trade Stocks*).

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Litan and eSpeed, and further in view of Downes (*Barron's Finance & Investment Handbook, 2nd Ed.*).

Summary of Amendment

Claims 1-5 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicants reserve the right to continue prosecution of these claims in a continuing application.

New claims 6-25 have been added. No new matter has been entered. Claims 6-25 are pending for consideration.

Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for extending the courtesy of allowing an in-person interview on September 13, 2006. As discussed during the interview, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the above-identified application, Applicants have cancelled previous

claims 1-5 and added new claims 6-25 directed to the “deal capture” aspect of the present invention. The new claims 6-25 are fully supported in the specification as originally filed as explained during the interview with respect to originally filed FIGs. 1-11. Accordingly, no new matter has been entered.

All Claims Comply with §103

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Litan in view of eSpeed. Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Litan and eSpeed, and further in view of Downes. Claims 1-5 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 6-25 has been added. To the extent applicable, Applicants respectfully submit that Litan, eSpeed, and Downes, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least a “remotely located, client operable deal capture computer interface” (claim 6), a “deal processing system for receiving captured deal information from said remote, client operated deal capture computer interface” (claim 16), or a “remotely located deal capture computer” (e.g., claim 23) as recited in the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after


consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: October 3, 2006

By: 
Kyle J. Choi
Reg. No. 41,480

Customer No.: 009626
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001